Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the presence of 11.3 parts per million of arsenic as  $As_2O_3$ . Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained an added poisonous ingredient, to wit, arsenic, as arsenious oxid, which might render said baking powder injurious to health.

On October 13, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5.

B. T. Galloway, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

Washington, D. C., February 18, 1914.

## 2916. Misbranding of potato chips. U. S. v. Alexander A. Walter and Alfred F. Walter (Walter & Co.). Plea of guilty. Each defendant fined \$12.50. (F. & D. No. 4540. I. S. No. 15341-d.)

On December 2, 1913, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Alexander A. Walter and Alfred F. Walter, doing business under the firm name of Walter & Co., Albany, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about February 3, 1912, from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, of a quantity of so-called potato chips which were misbranded. The product was labeled: "Blue Ribbon Peptonized Potato Chips, Established 1900. Potato Chips Manufactured only by A. A. Walter & Co., Albany, N. Y. The Best you ever ate. Absolute cleanliness observed in manufacturing."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

	Per cent.
Water	. 4.39
Fat	. 36. 90
Ash	. 3.07
Total nitrogen	. 0.95
Nitrogen precipitated by zinc sulphate	. 0.46
The potato chips had not been peptonized and no active peptonizing agent wa	s
present.	

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was labeled as set forth above, and thereby said defendants held out and represented to purchasers and consumers thereof that the articles were peptonized and contained peptonizing agents and properties, whereas, in truth and in fact, said labels and the words thereon contained were false, in that the said articles were not peptonized and contained no peptonizing agents or properties whatever, and thereby said labels and the words thereon contained were misleading, in that they were calculated to deceive the purchasers of said articles of food as aforesaid.

On December 8, 1913, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$12.50 on each defendant.

B. T. Galloway, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

Washington, D. C., February 18, 1914.

## 2917. Misbranding of canned peas. U. S. v. The John Boyle Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 4545. I. S. No. 17463-d.)

On July 16, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against The John Boyle Co., a corporation, Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on February 19, 1912, from the State of Maryland into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of canned peas which were misbranded. The product was labeled: (On shipping case) "2 doz. Size No. 2 Lotta Brand Peas Soaked Horner Chicago."